United Nations A/C.1/61/PV.22

General Assembly
Sixty-first session

Official Records

First Committee
22nd meeting
Friday, 27 October 2006, at 3 p.m.
New York

Chairperson: Mrs. Juul ..... (Norway)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 82 to 97 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairperson: The Committee will continue to take action on the remaining draft resolutions that appear in informal paper No. 2, starting with cluster 6, namely "Other disarmament measures and international security".

After completing action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, the Committee will then proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, namely "Disarmament machinery", starting with draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.12. Once action on those remaining draft resolutions in informal paper No. 2 is concluded, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 and A/C.1/61/L.44, contained in cluster 1, and A/C.1/61/L.38, contained in cluster 6 of informal paper No. 3, which was distributed yesterday.

I would like to inform the Committee that at the request of the sponsoring delegations, action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, contained in cluster 1 of informal paper No. 3, has been postponed to our next meeting.

Before proceeding, I would also like to inform members that prior to adjourning today's meeting, I will briefly suspend the meeting so that we may have the certificate awards ceremony for the disarmament fellows.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 6 in informal paper No. 2.

The Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.37. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.37, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 16th meeting, on 18 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.37 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1-3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic,

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

06-59132 (E)

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.37 was adopted by 158 votes to 1

[Subsequently, the delegations of Haiti and Niger advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery", of informal working paper No. 2.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.12.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.12, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 19th meeting, on 23 October. Sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.12 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1 and 2.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Resolution A/C.1/61/L.12 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 19th meeting, on 23 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.24 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1, 2 and 3.

Madam Chairperson, with your permission, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

> "Under the terms of operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24, the General Assembly would, respectively, 'request[ ] the Secretary-General to continue to provide the necessary support to the Regional Centre for better achievements and results' and also 'request[ ] the Secretary-General to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of peace, security and development, and to continue to provide assistance towards stabilizing the financial situation of the Centre'.
>
> "As concerns operative paragraph 5, a provision under section 4, Disarmament, of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007, covers, among other things, one P-5 post of Director of the Regional Centre at Lomé. The programme activities of the Regional Centre

would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources.

"The facilitation of cooperation between the Centre and the African Union and the provision of assistance towards stabilizing the financial situation of the Centre as requested in operative paragraph 6 would also be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, Disarmament, of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. Therefore, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

"The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and also reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

"Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Resolution A/C.1/61/L.24 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the 19th meeting, on 23 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.28 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1.

Madam Chairperson, with your permission, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

"Under the terms of operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28, the General Assembly would 'request [] the Secretary-General, taking note of paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 49/76 D of 15 December 1994, to provide the Regional Centre with the necessary support, within existing resources, in carrying out its programme of activities' and 'urge [] the Secretary-General to complete, without any further delay, the internal procedure for finalizing the host country agreement and the related memorandum of understanding and to ensure the physical operation of the Regional Centre from Kathmandu within six months of the date of signature of the host country agreement to enable the Centre to function effectively'.

"The implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, Disarmament, of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The provision contained therein covers a P-5 post for the Director of the Regional Centre. The programme of activities of the Centre would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources.

"As concerns operative paragraph 6 regarding the physical operation of the Region Centre for Kathmandu, the Department for Disarmament Affairs would continue consultations with the Government of Nepal. The physical operation of the Centre from Kathmandu would be funded from extra-budgetary resources.

"The attention of the Committee is again drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and also reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

"Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objections, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee has now completed taking action on Cluster 7 "Disarmament Machinery".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in informal paper No. 3, cluster 1 on nuclear weapons.

I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan to explain the vote before the voting on cluster 1, nuclear weapons.

Mr. Qazi (Pakistan): I have requested the floor to explain the vote before the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of disarmament commitments" contained in document A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2.

Pakistan supports the objectives of universal and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. In 2004, my delegation appreciated the efforts of the sponsors in revising the contents of the draft resolution to accommodate Pakistan's position. Last year, the decision by the sponsors of the resolution to call for Pakistan's accession to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) without conditions obliged us to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole and to vote against operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

The history and context of nuclear testing in South Asia is clear. Pakistan was not the first to test. The nuclear testing in South Asia in 1974, followed by further nuclear explosions on 11 and 13 May 1998, disrupted the strategic balance in the region. Pakistan had no choice but to conduct its test to restore strategic stability.

We are disappointed that, this year, the sponsors have chosen to insert discriminatory and selective modifications in operative paragraph 6 by condemning nuclear tests conducted by States that are not yet parties to the NPT. This is yet another example of compromising on principles of objectivity, non-discrimination and fairness. The sponsors are obviously unable to speak the whole truth to power. By doing so, the New Agenda Coalition has undermined its own credibility, as well as the object and purpose of the draft resolution.

In view of the unwarranted and unacceptable changes made in the draft resolution, Pakistan will be obliged to vote against it.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote before the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2.

India remains committed to the goal of complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We are equally concerned about the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use.

India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to believe that the best and most effective non-proliferation measure would be a credible, time-bound programme for global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

Given the title and core objective of the draft resolution, which seeks a nuclear-weapon-free world, we expected references in it to no-first-use and non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, as well as to the reduction of nuclear dangers through de-alerting, as such steps can constitute important interim measures pending progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons. These and certain other positive proposals contained in the resolution adopted in previous years are not reflected in the draft resolution now placed before us.

Furthermore, we are surprised by the changes between A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.1 and A/C.1/61/Rev.2, now placed on the table for our consideration. Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 no longer condemns all nuclear weapon tests by States parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), as if for the sponsors it is all right for NPT States parties to have tested and not for States non-party to the NPT. While we perfectly understand the rationale behind the first part of operative paragraph 6 in addressing the nuclear-

weapon test conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 9 October, as indeed has been done in two other resolutions we have already adopted in this Committee, a selective and retrospective condemnation of past nuclear weapon tests in the second part of operative paragraph 6 is both misplaced and unnecessary. Also, it may be presumptuous on the part of our Committee to condemn nuclear-weapon tests in the future that may or may not be conducted.

Finally, India cannot accept the call to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Our objections to the final document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference are well known. In urging India to accede to the NPT promptly and without conditions, the draft resolution negates the rules of customary international law as enshrined in the Law of Treaties of Vienna, which expressly provides that a State's acceptance, ratification or accession to a treaty is based on the principle of free consent. We shall, therefore, be constrained to vote against this draft resolution.

Mr. Kim Kwang Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea opposes operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, since it deals with the nuclear test by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in a one-sided and biased manner.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea reiterates its principled position that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will make every possible effort to realize the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and to promote global nuclear disarmament and the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on cluster 1 of informal paper No. 3, "Nuclear weapons".

The Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 18th meeting, on 20 October.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and addenda 2 and 3 thereto.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Israel, Pakistan, Togo, United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Belarus, Bhutan, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Malawi, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 was adopted by 147 votes to 8, with 12 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Togo informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: We will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*", which is contained in cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". We will then take action on one draft resolution in cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security", that is, A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments". None of the other draft resolutions contained in informal paper No. 3 is ready for action at this stage.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44.A recorded vote has been requested.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*", was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the 10th meeting, on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.44 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and addenda 1 and 3 thereto. In addition, Jordan has become a sponsor.

The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44 was retained by 159 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44 as a whole.

I give the floor to the Secretary to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Montenegro, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44 as a whole was adopted by 117 votes to 27, with 26 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Australia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

The Chairperson: I will now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, as a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". We did so because of our commitment to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Venezuela is firmly convinced that multilateral efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation should be implemented simultaneously and on a non-discriminatory basis, with a view to achieving the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Thus, just as Venezuela rejects nuclear tests, my country believes that the existence of nuclear weapons poses a threat to the survival of humanity. We therefore believe that the only true guarantee against the threat or use of such weapons is their total elimination. International peace and security should not be based on privilege and discrimination, which can only lead to a fragile peace. We therefore appeal for an end to the development of nuclear weapons and for the

destruction of those that already exist. We are convinced that the best way of achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world is for all States, without exception, to adhere to the multilateral treaties negotiated in that area and to respect and apply their provisions.

The international community should work tirelessly to ensure the universality of the NPT and the prompt entry into force of the CTBT.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.44, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

We greatly appreciate Malaysia's sincere attitude and firm commitment to the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament, which led it to propose the draft resolution.

Japan believes that, because of the immense power of nuclear weapons to cause destruction and death and injury to human beings, their use is clearly contrary to the fundamental humanitarianism that provides the philosophical foundation of international law. Therefore, we would like to stress that nuclear weapons should never be used again, and that continuous efforts should be made towards achieving a world free from nuclear weapons.

However, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice to which the draft resolution refers clearly demonstrates the complexities of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the International Court of Justice on the existing obligations under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude negotiations on the matter in good faith. Japan firmly believes that we must take concrete measures to achieve steady, step-by-step progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

In this context, we believe that it is premature to call upon all States — as paragraph 2 of the draft resolution does —

> "immediately to fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons".

We believe that steady, incremental progress should be made prior to our embarking upon the negotiations that all States are called upon to commence under draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44. That is the reason why Japan abstained on the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is the cornerstone of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects and was originally drafted to be in force for 25 years. The 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference decided to extend the Treaty, in a package of agreements and commitments, including, in particular, the obligation of the nuclear-weapon States to make systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goals of eliminating those weapons, and the Middle East resolution.

As a follow-up to those disarmament obligations, the 2000 NPT Review Conference agreed by consensus on 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement article VI of the NPT and paragraphs 3 and 4 (c) of the 1995 decision on Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament.

However, 11 years after the indefinite extension of the NPT and 36 years after the Treaty entered into force, the nuclear disarmament obligations have yet to be implemented. The international community has on many occasions expressed its serious concern about the lack of progress by the nuclear-weapon States towards accomplishing the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Serious concerns have also been expressed about the development of new types of nuclear weapons, which is in clear contravention of the undertakings provided by the nuclear-weapon States at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty to the effect that the Treaty would prevent the improvement of existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons.

Based on its principled position, the Islamic Republic of Iran fully supports the total elimination of

nuclear weapons leading to a nuclear-weapon-free world. In this context, last year my delegation introduced the draft resolution that was adopted as resolution 60/72, which called for follow up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the States parties to the NPT. In our view, nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects are mutually reinforcing. The inalienable rights of the States parties to the NPT must also be respected without any discrimination.

The General Assembly, by its resolution 60/72, urged the States parties to the NPT to follow up the implementation of the nuclear disarmament obligations under the Treaty agreed in 1995 and 2000 within the framework of the 2010 NPT Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee. We continue to vigorously pursue this recommendation, and for that reason my delegation also supported draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". We would like to explain our vote in the light of our basic and consistent position on the issue of nuclear disarmament.

China has always stood for the complete prohibition and full destruction of nuclear weapons in order to promote the process of nuclear disarmament. It is our position that, first, an international legal instrument on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons should be concluded at an early date.

Second, nuclear disarmament should be a just and reasonable process of gradual reductions towards a balance at ever-lower levels. The two States possessing the largest nuclear arsenals bear special and primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament. They should comply in good faith with the existing treaties on the reduction of nuclear weapons by further reducing their nuclear arsenals in a verifiable and irreversible manner so as to create conditions for achieving the ultimate goal of complete and thorough nuclear disarmament.

Third, before the goal of complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons is achieved, nuclear-weapon States should commit themselves to the non-first use of nuclear weapons and undertake unconditionally not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Fourth, nuclear-weapon States should abandon policies of nuclear deterrence based on first use of nuclear weapons and should reduce the role of nuclear weapons in national security.

Fifth, nuclear disarmament measures, including intermediate measures, should follow the guidelines of maintaining global strategic balance and stability and undiminished security for all.

Sixth, preventing the weaponization of outer space and an arms race in outer space would be conducive to promoting the process of nuclear disarmament.

Seventh, the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva should reach early agreement on its programme of work so as to establish ad hoc committees on nuclear disarmament, security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States, a fissile material cut-off and the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and should begin substantive work on those issues.

We endorse the purposes, objectives and major ingredients for promoting nuclear disarmament and achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world at an early date as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, and in draft resolutions A/C.1/61/L.32* and A/C.1/61/L.35, adopted previously. At the same we believe that there is room for improvement for all those draft resolutions.

Some of the measures set out in draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", are not feasible for the time being, and we thus have reservations about them. We therefore abstained in the voting on that draft resolution.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.39, "Nuclear disarmament".

Mr. MacLachlan (Australia): I take the floor to explain the Australian delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2. Australia took the decision to abstain in the vote, although we welcome the changes made to this year's draft text. There is much in the draft resolution we support, such as its call on all States to respect their obligations under the

Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its new provision condemning nuclear tests, in particular the nuclear test carried out by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea earlier this month.

However, we continue to have reservations about some elements of the draft resolution. In particular, it continues not to acknowledge the progress already made in reducing nuclear arsenals. We also consider that it is not constructive to list countries in calling for universalization of the Treaty. Australia strongly supports universality for the NPT and continues to urge those yet to join the Treaty to do so as non-nuclear-weapon States. Australia remains actively committed to the objective of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I would like to make a joint explanation of vote for A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". I am speaking on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

This draft resolution contains many elements that are not acceptable to France, the United Kingdom and the United States. The title still does not reflect the progress being made towards nuclear disarmament. The content of the draft resolution does not take due account of a full range of obligations on the part of all States towards nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament or of the most pressing, contemporary challenges to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and global security.

France, the United Kingdom and the United States remain fully committed to meeting our obligations as strictly provided for under article VI of the NPT. We have taken significant measures on nuclear disarmament ourselves and support nuclear weapons reduction worldwide.

Unfortunately, this draft resolution takes account neither of the concrete progress that has been made in this regard nor of the current ongoing efforts undertaken by our three countries. For example, it does not mention the dismantling of fissile nuclear material production facilities for weapons purposes or the reductions of nuclear arsenals, including those pursued under the Moscow Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions. Furthermore, this draft resolution does not mention our countries' public commitment, made on several occasions this year, to begin negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty as a matter of high priority.

We are committed to exploring ways to achieve further progress under article VI of the NPT and to strengthen the global non-proliferation regime. We continue to believe that the international community must take responsibility and address the serious current threats posed to peace and security by proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We hope that the ongoing dialogue among States parties will help lead to a future strengthening of the NPT. We are convinced that this draft resolution remains divisive.

Mr. Anton V. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to explain our votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 and A/C.1/61/L.44. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, we take note of the realistic and well-balanced efforts that have been made. Last year, a number of provisions were withdrawn from a similar draft resolution, but we were still unable to accept. The draft resolution contains a series of very important provisions that we support, but this year, we were unable to change our position, and that is why we abstained. We have some difficulty in accepting the idea of artificially accelerating nuclear disarmament without taking into account the technical, political and financial constraints.

The Russian Federation is strongly devoted to its commitments under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and other nuclear arms reduction agreements. Such commitments are proved through the concrete measures we have taken. We believe that the total elimination of nuclear weapons will be possible only within the framework of a progressive, multi-stage process aimed at attaining that ultimate objective, without artificial acceleration, on the basis of an integrated approach and with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States — an approach that maintains strategic stability and respects the principle of equal security for all. We also believe that there is no reason to refer in the draft resolution — and even to appear to approve of — a number of recommendations made by non-governmental organizations.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44, the reasons that the Russian Federation is not in a position

to support that document are known to all and have not changed. However, the way in which we voted on the draft does not mean that we take a negative view of all of its provisions. At the same time, this year's text of the draft resolution covers a number of important new elements on which we wish to state our position.

In principle, the Russian Federation favours the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. That is why we welcome the signing of the Semipalatinsk Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, referred to for the first time in the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44. The establishment of that new nuclear-weapon-free zone is undoubtedly a genuine success. The Treaty is an important step that will help to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime and will enable us to enhance peace and stability in the region. It will also help to avert the threat of nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists.

The Chairperson: As there are no other delegations wishing to explain their vote after the voting, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security", set out in informal working paper No. 3.

The Committee will first proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate vote has been requested on paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 7 (b) and 9. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 12 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.38 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add. 1, 2 and 3 thereto. In addition, Guyana has become a sponsor.

With the Chair's permission, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

> "By operative paragraphs 7 (b) and 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, the General Assembly would, respectively,
>
> '[Request] the Secretary-General, with a view to the three-year cycle regarding review of the Register, to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2009 to review the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development;' and
>
> '[Request] the Secretary-General to implement the recommendations contained in his 2000, 2003 and 2006 reports on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development and to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for the Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register'.
>
> "Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 7(b) of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the Panel of Governmental Experts would hold three sessions — one in Geneva and two in New York — in 2009.
>
> "The conference servicing requirements for the three sessions of the Group of Governmental Experts in 2009 are estimated to be $562,500 at current rates. In addition, the non-conference servicing requirements have been estimated at $402,170, which include travel of experts and cost of consultant for the substantive servicing of the organizational sessions of the proposed Group of Governmental Experts in 2009.
>
> "Regarding the request contained in operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, additional resources to ensure the continuing operation and maintenance of the Register would be required.
>
> "The above requirements would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-20009. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, no additional requirements would arise for the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

"Once again, the attention of this Committee is drawn to the provision of Section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions."

This concludes the oral statement by the Secretary-General.

The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 140 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Mauritania informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico,

Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Mauritania informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria,

Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38. A recorded vote has been requested.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 139 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia,

Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 140 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, as a whole, was adopted by 141 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chairperson: I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to explain their votes on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

As it did last year on a similar text, Cuba abstained in the vote on this draft resolution as a whole. We also abstained in the separate votes on paragraphs 2, 3, 6 and 9. My country believes that

transparency in armaments is an important factor in creating a climate of confidence and in easing tension between States. We consider that the United Nations Register is a concrete measure that can contribute to that goal. For those reasons, Cuba consistently participates in the Register of Conventional Arms and every year sends the relevant information to the Secretary-General.

At the same time, we note with concern the ever-increasing emphasis on including information on small arms and light weapons in the Register, while absolutely no progress is being made in including information about weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons.

We have always stressed the need for the Register to be balanced, comprehensive and non-discriminatory. The inclusion in the Register of requests for information on weapons of mass destruction and on transfers of equipment and technologies directly linked to the development and production of such weapons would make the Register a more balanced instrument and would facilitate its universality. The Register must not be an end in itself, but rather a means to make progress towards the objective of greater national, regional and international security for all States.

With regard to operative paragraph 9, we feel that the Conference on Disarmament has already concluded its work on transparency. The decision on whether or not to resume consideration of the subject is for the Conference on Disarmament alone to make. Cuba reserves the right to take a final position on this in the Conference. In doing so, it will take into account the need for that body to adopt a balanced programme of work based on the disarmament priorities established by the General Assembly.

I turn now to the groups of experts that have been established every three years to review the Register. Despite the interest that my country expressed in 2005 in becoming a member of the current group, no Cuban expert was included. Although Cuba voted in favour of sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, we wish once again to register our concern about the process of deciding on the composition of the group of experts established under resolutions recommended to the Assembly by the First Committee. Both in 2004 and in 2005, Cuba expressed an interest in participating in various such groups. For reasons we do not know, Cuba was not represented in any of these groups, even though we note a certain repetition among the Member States selected from Latin America and the Caribbean. We hope that these points will be duly taken into account by the Secretariat when the composition of future groups of experts is decided.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, as a mechanism for transparency in the field of conventional weapons transfers, can be beneficial in strengthening trust among countries. China attaches great importance to this mechanism and has made active efforts for its establishment, development and continuous improvement.

China first participated in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms regime in 1993. However, starting in 1996, a certain country, in violation of the spirit of the relevant General Assembly resolution and the purposes and principles of the Register, insisted on registering its illicit weapons sales to China's Taiwan province. This action forced China to suspend temporarily its participation in the Register and has made it impossible for China to support resolutions on transparency in armaments in recent years.

China has noted with satisfaction that, with the concerted efforts of all parties, the Group of Governmental Experts on the Register made significant progress this year. The report, agreed by the Group of Experts and submitted to the General Assembly, affirmed, among other things, the important principle that the Register should only include arms transfers among States Members of the United Nations.

We have also noted that the previously mentioned country corrected the disputed practice this year. Accordingly, the Chinese delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on transparency in armaments.

I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate that transparency in armaments is of great significance to strengthening international peace and security, but the relationship between the two is not one of simple causality. Transparency in armaments should observe the principle of undiminished security for all and measures to achieve transparency should be reasonable and feasible. Attempts to enforce a uniform level of transparency are inappropriate.

Mr. Qazi (Pakistan): I requested the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments". General Assembly resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, the first resolution on the issue of transparency in armaments, affirmed that transparency in the field of armaments could reduce the occurrence of dangerous misperceptions about the intentions of States and thereby enhance trust and confidence among them. We agree with that assertion.

According to the same resolution, the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms was envisaged as a first step in confidence-building among States. However, 15 years hence, it is clear that the objectives of promoting transparency in armaments remain far from being achieved.

What we have seen in these years is an excessive and destabilizing arms build-up in various parts of the world. We therefore continue to believe that promoting transparency should not become an end in itself. All Member States agreed in the final document of the first Special Session on Disarmament that gradual reduction of military budgets on a mutually agreed basis — in absolute figures or in terms of percentage points — particularly by nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, would contribute to curbing the arms race and would increase the possibility of reallocating resources being used for military purposes to economic and social development. It further reaffirmed that it was possible to achieve reductions in military budgets without affecting the military balance to the detriment of the national security of any State.

These agreed objectives have yet to be translated into action. Earnest and parallel efforts are therefore needed to address the underlying causes that have so far prevented the realization of the objectives of this resolution. In our view, it is important to redouble efforts towards the balanced production of armaments and forces, restraint in the provision and acquisition of destabilizing arms, easing regional and subregional tensions and finding the just resolution of conflicts.

Pakistan has pursued, and will continue to pursue, a comprehensive regime in South Asia, encompassing the elements just outlined.

Mr. Darwish (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I want to explain the vote of the Syrian Arab Republic on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

My delegation would like to confirm its unswerving support for the position adopted by member States of the League of Arab States with regard to the subject of transparency in armaments. My delegation would also like to confirm its total support for a universal approach towards building an international community free of the use or the threat of use of force, a world governed by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, based on justice, equality and peace.

While we confirm our readiness to participate in any international effort designed, with good intentions, to achieve these objectives, we draw the attention of the First Committee to the fact that the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments" does not take into account the special situation in the Middle East, where the Arab-Israeli conflict persists because Israel continues to occupy Arab territories, refuses to implement the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and continues to receive, from some major Powers, all kinds of weapons of mass destruction. Not only does Israel have the capacity to develop, produce and stockpile arms, including nuclear weapons, but it also possesses the most advanced conventional weapons.

My delegation would now like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments", on behalf of the League of Arab States.

The States members of the League of Arab States would like to reaffirm their position concerning transparency in armaments, in particular in connection with the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

For many years, the members of the League of Arab States have expressed their views on the whole issue of transparency in armaments. The States members of the Arab League believe that it is important to maintain the Register. Their views are clear and well established, and are based on a general approach concerning issues of international disarmament and on a special approach dictated by the distinct character of the situation in the Middle East.

The members of the Arab League support transparency in armaments as a means to strengthen

international peace and security. They believe that, if any transparency mechanism is to succeed, it should be guided by certain basic principles and should be balanced, transparent and non-discriminatory. It should strengthen the security of all nations at the national, regional and international levels, in accordance with international law. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms represents the international community's first — albeit long overdue — attempt to address the issue of transparency at the international level.

No one could doubt the potential value of the Register as an international measure to build confidence and as a mechanism for early warning. However, the Register still faces a number of problems, the most important of which is the failure of about half of the States Members of the United Nations to provide information to the Register.

States members of the Arab League believe that it is important to expand the Register, especially given that recent experience proves that the Register, which is limited to seven categories of conventional arms, will not be implemented with universal participation. Many countries, including some States members of the Arab League, are of the view that, because of its present limited scope, the Register does not respond sufficiently to their security needs.

The scope of the Register in the future will, therefore, depend on the desire of the members of the international community to achieve greater transparency and build greater confidence.

Resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, which provided for the establishment of the Register, also provided for its expansion to include information on more sophisticated conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons and state-of-the-art technology with military applications, which would make the Register more balanced and comprehensive and less discriminatory in character and have more participants on a regular basis.

The Middle East region is a special situation, since it is characterized by imbalance in the field of armaments. Confidence-building requires the balanced and comprehensive promotion of transparency. To take a transparent approach to the situation in the Middle East based on the principle of the seven categories of conventional weapons, entirely disregarding the most lethal and sophisticated types of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, is neither balanced nor comprehensive. It will not achieve the desired results, especially given that the Register does not take into account the situation prevailing in the Middle East.

Israel's occupation of Arab territories continues, and it still possesses the most lethal weapons of mass destruction. Israel is still the only country in the region that is not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It insists on ignoring the repeated calls by the international community to accede to the NPT and to subject all its nuclear facilities to the comprehensive International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards regime. This prompted member States of the NPT to insist during the review conference in 2000 on the need for Israel to take these steps.

Member States of the Arab League regret that the previous Group of Governmental Experts failed to expand the scope of the Register to include military stocks and acquisitions derived from national production, just as it also failed to include weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons. This runs counter to the provisions of the General Assembly resolution 48/36 L, under which the Register was established.

This failure is a reflection of the failure of the Register and, therefore, of its inability in its present form to be an effective means to build confidence or to be an early warning mechanism. In the light of the above, member States of the Arab League express their reservations on the approach adopted in the draft resolution.

The Chairperson: As I stated earlier, I would like to inform the Committee that the ceremony of presentation of the 2006 United Nations Disarmament Fellowship certificates will now take place. I ask all delegations to remain in their seats for the ceremony in order to congratulate and encourage our junior colleagues. We will suspend the meeting in order to proceed with the ceremony in an informal mode.

The meeting was suspended at 5 p.m. and resumed at 5.20 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.